

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments.

Antecedent basis for the amendments in the disclosure is found at page 1, lines 24-29.

The rejection of Claim 8 as being anticipated by Abitbol et al. under 35 U.S.C. ¶102(a) is traversed, and reconsideration is requested in light of the foregoing amendments to Claim 8 and the following brief remarks.

The Office Action does not explain where in the Abitbol et al. document is a teaching of a method in which the local distribution of the focus beams is detected. Nor is there any teaching of implementing this prior art method in a lens configured as in Claim 1 and now defined in Claim 8.


Accordingly, early and favorable action on all the claims is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056208.56191US).

Respectfully submitted,

September 24, 2007



James F. McKeown
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JFM:jeh